

Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Helix papillaris* Müller, 1774 (currently *Papillifera papillaris*; Mollusca, Gastropoda)
(Case 3319; see BZN 62: 130–133)

(1) Francisco W. Welter-Schultes

Zoologisches Institut, Berliner Str. 28, D-37073 Goettingen, Germany

I do not support the application by Giusti & Manganelli requesting the conservation of the name *Helix papillaris* Müller, 1774 and suppression of *Turbo bidens* Linnaeus, 1758. I think that a simple species taxon possibly being threatened by a senior synonym alone does not justify an application to the Commission. *Helix papillaris* is not the type species of an important genus so, apart from this single species name, nothing more is threatened. Species names have to be replaced by older synonyms, this is something that happens from time to time and malacologists are used to this. Although *Papillifera papillaris* is a well-known name, I could also live with this name being changed. Both names were used in the recent past. Nordsieck (2002, p. 36) used the name *Papillifera bidens*. Dhora & Welter-Schultes (1996, p. 136) cited both names.

At first I agreed with most points raised by Giusti & Manganelli (2005). Gualtieri's (1742) pl. 4 fig. C seems to represent a specimen of *Cochlodina laminata* (Montagu, 1803) or another species with reddish shell and without white dots along the suture. Buonanni's (1684) section 3, fig. 41 seems to represent a specimen of *Helix papillaris* Müller, 1774, or a conchologically similar species. It is possible that the Latin words of Linnaeus's diagnosis did not really match the species with the dots on the suture. Fixing a neotype for *Helix papillaris* Müller, 1774 seemed to be justified because obviously (in contrast to Giusti & Manganelli's initial statement) Müller's diagnosis was not clear enough. However, there remains material to be discussed. To me it seems that Linnaeus (1758) had several different species in mind. Giusti & Manganelli ignored the point that Linnaeus himself tried to specify what he meant when, in the 12th edition (1767, p. 1240), he added Buonanni's figure to the list of references ('Bonan. recr. 3. t. 41. Aucta.'). This suggests that this figure also obviously matched Linnaeus's idea of the species or the specimens he examined. However, the text of the description alone does not convince me that he could not have meant *P. papillaris*. Schröter (1784, p. 55) referred to Linné, 1767 (not to Linnaeus, 1758) and suspected that the citation by Gualtieri (1742, pl. 4, fig. C) was an error and had to be replaced by figs. D and E. In my opinion this is a possible and justified interpretation considering that the confusion was initiated by Linnaeus himself. As the first reviser, Schröter intended to specify which species Linnaeus had meant among several possible ones. He explicitly mentioned a specimen from Firenze in his collection.

Citing Rossmässler's (1835) Latin malacological dictionary, Giusti & Manganelli claimed that the name *Helix papillaris* cannot be derived from the original Latin text. I am not convinced for three reasons. First, Rossmässler's publication was issued nearly 80 years after Linnaeus's description. We have to consider that in the meantime it had become necessary to define and fix Latin malacological expressions because nobody spoke Latin except a few scientists, the language developed faster than any other language and many terms had been unclear. Second, there are reasons

to suspect that Linnaeus did not mention the white dots for good reasons. In old and eroded shells the white dots are expressed much more faintly than in fresh shells. It is also possible that Linnaeus saw some shells with dots and some without, and did not mention the dots because he thought this feature was not characteristic for what he thought was one species. And third, a possible misinterpretation of the Latin text, particularly the expression 'sutura subcrenata', would also apply to Linnaeus himself as demonstrated in the 1767 work. If the Latin description was clear and the words were misinterpreted by Schröter and Falkner et al., Linnaeus is also to be added to the list of authors who misinterpreted his own text. However, this does not make much sense. It remained unclear what Linnaeus really meant and Schröter had to make a decision.

I do not think that it is useful and necessary, at the current state of discussion, to ask the Commission to solve the problem. The malacologists can and should solve the problem internally. The neotype designation by Falkner et al. (2002) for *Turbo bidens* is not effective. It does not fit the condition that a neotype must be based on a specimen deposited in a research collection of a recognized scientific or educational institution, cited by name (Article 75.3.7). I would recommend designating the neotype of *Helix papillaris* Müller, 1774 as the neotype of *Turbo bidens* Linnaeus, 1758. This action would also be in accord with Schröter's revision because the neotype specimen is from Firenze. No decision by the Commission is necessary. I am also against placing a name on an Official List or Index. I am generally opposed to the idea of an Official List, for which I see no need. In my opinion the historical nomenclatural system is sufficient.

Additional references

- Buonanni, F.** 1684. *Recreatio mentis, et oculi in observatione Animalium Testaceorum curiosi naturæ inspectoribus: Italico sermone primum proposita . . . nunc denuo ab eodem Latine oblata, centum additis Testaceorum iconibus, circa quæ varia problemata proponuntur.* xvi, 270 [10] pp., 139 pls. Romae.
- Dhora, D. & Welter-Schultes, F.W.** 1996. List of species and atlas of the non-marine molluscs of Albania. *Schriften zur Malakozoologie*, **9**: 90–197.

(2) Michael Hölling

Spanischer Weg 32, 44143 Dortmund, Germany

I would like to bring to your attention the fact that Falkner, Ripken & Falkner, (2002, pp. 112–113), in a checklist of French continental molluscs published in the context of the CLECOM-project, selected a neotype for *Turbo bidens* Linnaeus, 1758, thereby stabilizing the usage of the name, which is also used by one of the leading clausiliid specialists, Hartmut Nordsieck (see <http://www.clausilia.de/>). Therefore, I consider the proposition of Giusti & Manganelli unnecessary.

(3) E. Gittenberger

National Museum of Natural History Naturalis | Institute of Biology, Leiden University, P.O. 9517 RA, Leiden, The Netherlands

I would like to emphasize that I agree with the proposals in BZN 62: 132. In my view stability is served the best possible way by accepting the proposals.